

Serial No. 09/941,386

705558US1

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants assert that the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is moot, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and reexamination and reconsideration of the claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-11 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vlahovic. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is well understood that in order for a claim to be anticipated by a prior art reference, each and every limitation of the claim must be disclosed by the cited reference. Applicants hereby renew and incorporate the arguments filed in the response mailed on November 13, 2002.

Without conceding to the Examiner's position, claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10-11 and 13-14 have been amended. In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants assert that the standing rejections are moot. Withdrawal of the rejections, and reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is courtcously solicited.

Claims 2 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Norlin. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants renew and incorporate the arguments filed in the response mailed on November 18, 2002.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants assert that the standing rejections are moot. Withdrawal of the rejections, and reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is courtcously solicited.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlahovic in view of the well known prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 9 and 12, as amended, depend either directly or indirectly from claims 2 and 8. Therefore, the rejection of these claims as being unpatentable over Vlahovic in view of the well